

REMARKS

Claims 1-42 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 17, 35, and 39 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-8 of the Reply. Claim 43 has been canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-11, 14-40, and 43 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-11, 14-40, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Coburn *et al.* (US 2002/0120921) in view of Linden *et al.* (US 5,551,030). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. Coburn *et al.*, either alone or in combination with Linden *et al.*, does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the subject invention.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) ***must teach or suggest all the claim limitations***. See MPEP §706.02(j) (emphasis added).

Applicant's invention relates to a system and methodology that facilitates automatic generation of control code that utilizes function objects within Human-Machine Interfaces (HMI). The subject matter as claimed thus enables an industrial system or process operator, not skilled in computer programming but familiar with the industrial system or process, to customize control code necessary for industrial automation. A historical component retains the history of each HMI object, including which template, if any, was used to create the object. The invention thus expedites the process of altering existing HMI objects by allowing a user to modify a template, and propagate the changes through a subset of HMI objects created from the template. The historical component links HMI objects and the templates used to create them. To this end,

amended independent claim 1 (and similarly amended independent claims 17, 35, and 39) recites *a historical component which links the HMI objects to templates used to create them, the system propagates changes made to the template through at least a subset of the HMI objects.*

Coburn *et al.*, either alone or in combination with Linden *et al.*, does not disclose or suggest these exemplary features of the claimed subject matter.

Coburn *et al.* relates generally to system software for managing the design, simulation, implementation, and maintenance of a manufacturing process. The cited document, however, does not disclose the historical component. The cited document discloses a HMI editor (*See* paragraph [0390]), and the use of templates (*See* paragraph [0092]). However, the document does not disclose using the templates to retroactively update items created from the template, as recited in the subject claims.

Examiner states that Coburn *et al.* does not disclose the analysis based at least in part on a relatedness of each object that comprises the HMI representation and a feasibility determination for implementing the HMI representation, and offers Linden *et al.* to cure this deficiency. However, Linden *et al.* does not remedy the aforementioned deficiencies with respect to Coburn *et al.* The cited document provides a system that allows two foreign programs to function together; however, there is no mention of templates nor of a historical component.

In view of the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Coburn *et al.*, either alone or in combination with Linden *et al.*, does not disclose all claim aspects. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 17, 35, and 39, and associated dependent claims is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 12, 13, 41, and 42 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 12, 13, 41, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Coburn *et al.* in view of Linden *et al.* in further view of Polz *et al.* (US 2004/0260518). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reason. Claims 12, 13, 41, and 42 depend from independent claims 1 and 39 respectively, and Polz *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Coburn *et al.* and Linden *et al.* with respect to claims 1 and 39. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [ALBRP315US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731